

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Applicati n N . | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/852,225 | AKAIKE, MITSURU | |
| | Examin r | Art Unit | |
| | Naschica S Morrison | 3632 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Naschica S Morrison. (3) Louis DeJudice.
 (2) Denise Poy. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Olson '295 and DE 3441225 to Groschupp.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and applicant discussed the rejection regarding claims 1-12. Examiner stated that Olson taught modifying the Admitted Prior Art stoppers to have a tapered shape and Groschupp further taught providing stoppers having the same shape and outer dimensions to form a continuous outer surface. Applicant argued that Olson and Groschupp teach away from each other since the manufacturing processes would require expensive tooling in order to form the continuously tapered outer surface.